REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 7, 10, 13, 14 and 29-46 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1-2, 7, 10, 13-14, 29-46 are amended. No claims are cancelled and no new claims are added. Support for the amendments can be found through the application as originally filed, such as, for example, at page 5, line 3 – page 6, line 9, page 6, line 13 – page 7, line 10, page 7, lines 14-21, page 11, line 14 – page 13, line 9, and at Figures 1, 3-6, and 9-10.

Drawings

The drawings stand objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5). The Examiner indicated that the drawings do not include reference numerals 86 (upper wall of the attachment bracket) and 184 (second plurality of apertures).

Applicant has amended the specification to delete reference numerals 86 and 184 from the specification. Applicant has also amended the specification to indicate that "[t]he second plurality of apertures" is not shown in the figures. Therefore, the Examiner's objections to the drawings are now moot.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) be withdrawn.

Specification

The disclosure stands objected to because of informalities. The Examiner has indicated that page 13, line 2 appears to contain a typographical error.

Applicant has amended the specification to provide that "the second sections 158 are seated on the attachment structures 50."

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claims 10 and 44-46 stand objected to because of informalities. The Examiner has indicated that claim 10 appears to contain a typographical error and that claims 44-46 are not accompanied by appropriate claim identifiers.

Applicant has amended claim 12 to change "comformingly" to "conformingly." Applicant has accompanied claim 44 with the status identifier of "Previously Presented" and has accompanied claims 45-46 with the status identifier of "Currently Amended."

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Examiner's objections to the claims because of informalities.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 33-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner has indicated that the limitations recited in claim 33 are vague, indefinite, and unclear.

Applicant has amended claim 33 to recite that "each of the first and second ends of the first and second cross beams is couplable to one of the main beams with one of the plurality of

attachment brackets." Claims 34 and 35 depend from claim 33 and therefore incorporate the aforementioned amended limitations of claim 33.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C § 112, second paragraph.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 36-37 and 41-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent no. 6,871,454 to Coday Sr., et al. ("Coday Sr."). Applicant traverses the rejections for at least the following reasons.

As amended, claim 36 recites "releasably receiving a first main beam and a second main beam in respective locked positions with first and second locks of a locking mechanism, each main beam including an upper surface and a side wall, the side wall defining a main beam length and including at least one track structure," "locking the first main beam in abutting registry with the second main beam and substantially aligning the side wall track structure of the first main beam with the side wall track structure of the second main beam when the first main beam and the second main beam are in the locked positions," "coupling a first cross beam transverse to the first main beam with an attachment bracket," "releasably engaging the side wall track structure of one of the first main beam or the second main beam with the attachment bracket," and "shiftably positioning the attachment bracket along and between the side wall track structure of the first main beam and the side wall track structure of the second main beam." Coday Sr. fails to disclose these limitations. Therefore, claim 36 is allowable.

Claims 37 and 41-42 depend from claim 36. Therefore, claims 37 and 41-42 are allowable for at least the same reasons set forth with respect to claim 36. The rejections of claims 37 and 41-41 are traversed but not expressly argued in view of the allowability of the underlying base claim.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Examiner's rejections of claims 36-37 and 41-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 7, 10, 29, 31-35, 43, and 45-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coday Sr. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,676,036 to Bessert ("Bessert"). Claims 13-14 and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coday Sr. in view of Bessert and in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,479,962 to Paulson ("Paulson"). Claim 30 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coday Sr. in view of Bessery in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,263,296 to Spera ("Spera"). Claims 38-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coday Sr. Claim 40 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coday Sr. in view of Spera. Applicant traverses the rejections for at least the following reasons.

As amended, claim 1 recites "first and second main beams, each main beam including an upper surface and a side wall, the side wall defining a main beam length and including at least one track structure," "a locking mechanism configured to releasably receive the first main beam and the second main beam in respective locked positions, the locking mechanism further configured to removably receive the first ground-engaging

leg, the locking mechanism including a first lock and a second lock oriented to releasably receive the first main beam and the second main beam respectively in abutting registry with the side wall track structure of the first main beam substantially aligned with the side wall track structure of the second main beam when the first main beam and the second main beam are in the locked positions," and "an attachment bracket configured to operably couple the first cross beam substantially transverse to the first main beam, the attachment bracket slidably receivable by the side wall track structure of the first main beam and the side wall track structure of the second main beam and shiftable along and between the side wall track structure of the first main beam and the side wall track structure of the second main beam when the first main beam and the second main beam are received by the first lock and the second lock of the locking mechanism in the locked positions." As amended, claim 43 recites "first and second main beams, each main beam including an upper surface and a side wall, the side wall defining a main beam length and including at least one track structure," "a locking means for releasably receiving the first main beam and the second main beam in respective locked positions and for locking the first main beam and the second main beam respectively in abutting registry with the side wall track structure of the first main beam substantially aligned with the side wall track structure of the second main beam when the first main beam and the second main beam are in the locked positions," and "an attachment means for operably coupling the first cross beam substantially transverse to the first main beam, the attachment means slidably receivable by the side wall track structure of the first main beam and the side wall track structure of the second main beam and shiftable along and between the side wall track structure of the first main beam and the side wall track structure of the second main beam when the first main beam and the second main beam are received by the locking means in the locked positions." Coday Sr. fails to discloses these limitations. Bessert, Paulson, and Spera, alone or in combination, fail to make up for the deficiencies of claims Coday Sr. at least with respect to claim 1 and 43. Therefore, claims 1 and 43 are allowable.

Claims 2, 7, 10, 13-14, and 29-35 depend from claim 1. Therefore, claims 2, 7, 10, 13-14, and 29-35 are allowable for at least the same reasons set forth with respect to claim 1. The rejections of claims 2, 7, 10, 13-14, and 29-35 are traversed but not expressly argued in view of the allowability of the underlying base claim.

Claims 44-46 depend from claim 43. Therefore, claims 44-46 are allowable for at least the same reasons set forth with respect to claim 43. The rejections of claims 44-46 are traversed but not expressly argued in view of the allowability of the underlying base claim.

Claims 38-40 depend from claim 36. As explained with respect to the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102, Coday Sr. fails to disclose the limitations of claim 36. Bessert, Paulson, and Spera, alone or in combination, fail to make up for the deficiencies of Coday Sr. at least with respect to claim 36. Therefore, claims 38-40 are allowable for at least the same reasons set forth with respect to claim 36. The rejections of claims 38-40 are traversed but not expressly argued in view of the allowability of the underlying base claim.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Examiner's rejections of claims 1-2, 7, 10, 13-14, 29-35, 38-40, and 43-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance.

Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

Ryan E. Strom

Registration No. 58,525

Customer No. 24113 Patterson Thuente Christensen Pedersen, P.A. 4800 IDS Center 80 South 8th Street Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2100

Telephone: 612-349-3011